DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 379 HE 033 144

AUTHOR Safarik, Lynn
TITLE The Transformative Role of Difference in the Development of Feminist Scholars at UCLA.
PUB DATE 2000-04-00
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000). Part of a doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, June 2000.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Consciousness Raising; *Discourse Analysis; Females; Feminism; *Feminist Criticism; Higher Education; Intellectual Disciplines; Interviews; *Oral History; Personal Narratives; Primary Sources; Recognition (Achievement); *Scholarship; Social History; Social Science Research; Statistical Analysis; *Womens Education
IDENTIFIERS *Poststructuralism; Transformative Research; *University of California Los Angeles

ABSTRACT

This study of academic feminism uses cultural and critical theory, feminist poststructuralism, and oral history to examine the transformative role of feminist scholarship in higher education. Nine feminist scholars were selected as participants using four sampling criteria: primary discipline (predominatly from the humanities and social sciences); generational cohort; professional age; and personal characteristics (race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender). All interviewees provided curriculum vitae and were interviewed by the researcher. Generational analysis of the development of these feminist scholars reveals how discursive resources available at different moments within the evolution of feminism shaped their identities as scholars and feminists. Those who were adults in the early 1970s used their experience to institutionalize feminism in the academy; those who were in graduate school during this period assimilated the newly emerging feminist values into the academic culture in which they were immersed; adolescents experienced the women's movement as a challenge to their forming sense of identity; and children of second-wave feminists, who are now young professors, take feminism for granted as an institutional norm. Running through their career/life stories is a common thread that forms a feminist cultural core: individuals' intellectual pursuits derived from a deeply felt personal desire for social justice. (Contains 27 references.) (CH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 443 379

The Transformative Role of Difference in the Development of Feminist Scholars at UCLA[1,2]

Lynn Safarik, Doctoral Candidate
University of California, Los Angeles
Division of Higher Education and Organizational Change

American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, Louisiana
April 27, 2000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. SAFARIK

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

[1] This paper is part of a dissertation: Safarik, L. (June, 2000). The transformative role of feminist scholarship at UCLA. Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, Division of Higher Education and Organizational Change.

[2]This manuscript has been submitted for review by a higher education journal.

HE 033 144

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Among the pressures facing our colleges and universities as we move into the twenty-first century, perhaps the most critical one is the need to define an ethical purpose that emphasizes building pluralistic communities in which multiple worldviews and cultures are valued and understood. Transforming the structures and processes through which knowledge is produced and distributed is central to the purpose of creating more emancipatory environments for learning and therefore, social change. Academic feminists, in addressing the problems of the relationship between experience and theory, access to knowledge and the patriarchal structure and content of knowledge have had an important role in transforming institutions of higher education.

Over the past several decades, academic feminisms, like other "emancipatory knowledges" that have gained legitimacy in the academy (e.g. critical and postcolonial discourses), have reconceptualized the process of knowledge production (Bensimon, 1984). These new epistemologies provide contradiction and conflict in academic organizations that serve to reveal and expose structures that marginalize certain members of the community. Beyond their additive value, these different constructions of reality challenge the basic theoretical and structural foundations of our institutions, offering new insights for how we might reshape them.

This inquiry into the transformative role of feminist scholarship in higher education has important implications for our understanding of the nature of organizational life in colleges and universities. Research about organizational transformation which focuses on how individual agency and collective power interrelate in the process of social change is particularly relevant at this postmodern moment in which epistemologies and scientific paradigms are in transition. The case of feminist

scholarship, while not the only movement within the academy that is transformative, provides a useful illustration of how the dialogic tensions that inhere the development of self and the relationship between the innovative and traditional culture, provide momentum for institutional change.

The extent to which feminist inquiry has changed practices or fundamentally restructured the academy is a matter of debate in the scholarly community. Whereas some scholars have compared the impact of women's studies to the major intellectual transformations in human history, others believe it is too early in the process to assess its impact (Boxer, 1998). This study enters a dialogue about the process of transformation, asking *how* feminist scholarship, as a new paradigm for inquiry, is transformative.

Analyses of the impacts of academic feminism suggest there is no discernible pattern or "stage theory" to help us understand the confluence of social, political, and structural factors that comprise this pervasive cultural shift. Instead, the process takes on different forms in different institutional contexts and is shaped by various intrainstitutional factors such as departmental and disciplinary structures and histories (Gumport, 1987). Because individuals bring their own personal and professional backgrounds to their scholarly careers, we should expect that transformation is best understood in terms of specific institutional contexts and through the lived experiences of those individuals who are both being transformed and are transforming the institution through their work. This study offers a subjective, local, and partial understanding of transformation and seeks to create a "snapshot" of the process at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Theoretical Framework

Until recently, research about academic feminism has focused on the process of legitimizing and institutionalizing this new knowledge in the academy (Gumport, 1987). The more radical goal of institutional transformation, has only recently been the subject of analyses of women's studies as a field (Boxer, 1998, Stewart & Stanton, 1995). This study extends this line of inquiry by using cultural and critical theory, feminist poststructuralism, and a contextual, life story approach in the tradition of oral history. Guided by cultural theory, transformation is conceptualized as the interaction between individual and collective consciousness, history, and institutional structures (Tierney, 1991).

Based on the assumption that organizational reality is neither mutually understood nor interpreted by all of the organization's participants, this study is guided by a critical perspective (Lincoln, 1991). In this view, the role of multiple value systems in organizations and the cultural tensions they produce, informs a conceptualization of how institutions can enact pluralistic environments. Feminist postructuralism is a useful theory for understanding feminists' transformative role in the academy since it accounts for both individual agency and the social and historical constraints imposed on subjectivity (Weedon, 1987).

These theoretical frameworks portend an investigation into the topic which focuses on individual and group meaning-making systems and which is contextually specific. The choice to locate the study at UCLA is based on the particular significance of the challenge to the research process posed by feminist scholarship in a large, urban research institution. This paper is part of a larger study of the role of feminist scholarship

in institutional transformation at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA),[1] which addressed the question: how do the perspectives, underlying values, forms of discourse, and organizational and social structures inherent in academic feminism transform the University by making it more emancipatory? In particular, the study examined the role of the Center for the Study of Women (CSW) in the transformation process. Focusing on the development of the nine participants in sociohistoric context, this paper investigates how these scholars developed a feminist consciousness and the relationship of that consciousness to their identity as scholars and role as transformative agents.

Methodology

This study was designed to understand the meaning of institutional transformation through the lived experiences of feminist scholars whose professional lives intersect in the context of UCLA and the Center for the Study of Women. This approach to understanding organizational life blends institutional history and personal biography and is what Smith (1994) termed prosopography. Nine feminist scholars who have worked at UCLA and been involved with the Center for the Study of Women since its establishment in 1984 were selected as participants. Using maximum variation sampling (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), the sample was varied according to four criteria: primary discipline, generational cohort; professional age, and personal identity with regard to race, ethnicity, sexual orientation and gender. These sampling criteria were designed to provide a sociohistoric context for understanding institutional transformation, to incorporate the

[1] Safarik, L. (June, 2000). The transformative role of feminist scholarship at UCLA. Dissertation for the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, Division of Higher Education and Organizational Change, University of California, Los Angeles.

structural and social contingencies associated with different disciplinary paradigms, and the different meanings the Center and transformation have for different individuals into the analysis. Participants were selected by reviewing Center documentation, the University faculty directory, and consulting with knowledgeable experts.

The decision to select participants primarily from the humanities and the social sciences was based on prior research which suggests that certain disciplines have been more deeply transformed by feminist scholarship than others and which, in some cases, regard the feminist critique as a necessary disciplinary component (Boxer, 1998; Stacey,1995; Gumport, 1987. The nine participants were selected from history, English, sociology, anthropology, art history, psychology, communications studies, urban planning and the law school. Since the purpose of the research is to understand the process of transformation, it was important to select disciplines that have been transformed at some level.

In the present study, prior generational analyses (Gumport, 1987; Astin & Leland, 1991) were used to understand the career development of the participants and to interpret their experiences of institutional transformation. Since the focus of the study was to understand the transformation process and the role of the Center for the Study of Women in this process, it was important to consider the participant's career in terms of their generational cohort as feminists, but also when they were granted tenured and when they became involved with the work of the Center. Adding these two criteria for sample selection provided greater understanding of how these institutional structures (e.g. the reward structure and the research unit) functioned in the transformation process.

Conceptual Framework

Organizational theorists describe the processes through which individual identity interacts with institutional meanings and structures as sensemaking and to the active role of individuals in creating their organizational environments as enacting culture (Weick, 1995; Morgan, 1997). Based on this conception of organizational life, a "four quadrant" model of social reality was adapted as an heuristic device for the design, data collection, and data analysis phases of the research (Wilber,1998). The four quadrants of Wilber's model, (i.e. individual/interior; individual/exterior, group/interior; and group/exterior), comprise an organizing framework for analyzing how individuals relate their own meaning-making systems to those of the collective culture and how they act on these beliefs and values within the structures of the institution (See figure 1).

The framework served as a tool for managing and conceptualizing the relationships between individuals, the community, and the various institutional structures in the process of transformation. At the individual/interior level, consciousness, constituted by historical processes that shape and reshape identity over time, is the primary means through which one receives and processes information. In poststructuralist terms, identity or self is constituted by the available discursive resources and this self is constantly in process. For feminists, consciousness-raising is the process through which feminist discourse provides an alternative, more emancipatory meaning-making system for interpreting the social world. For academic feminists, feminist discourse competes with traditional academic discourse in the process of forming identity. The specific ways in which individual feminists interpreted their past and

present lives as well as their visions for the future, provided insights about why and how they act and do not act as social change agents.

The ways in which individuals interact with their environment is conceptualized as the individual/exterior quadrant. In a university setting, faculty primarily interact within the departmental structure through teaching, research, and service functions, and within other structures that are part of the larger institution, such as the Center for the Study of Women. There are various ways a scholar might interact as a change agent, including advocating for policy changes, mentoring, teaching, and interacting with colleagues in ways that create more emancipatory environments. Community-building, or providing leadership for the establishment and maintenance (i.e. institutionalization) of structures and processes that are emancipatory, is a way that feminists function as change agents in the individual/exterior dimension of the organization.

The collective feminist consciousness on campus was conceptualized as the group/interior dimension of the framework. Data which referred to the shared meanings of the feminist community through stories of shifting priorities, internal and external conflicts, and through the programs and practices of the CSW were identified as the potential sources of insights about the collective feminist culture. The fourth quadrant, the group/exterior level, represented the ways in which the collective consciousness has interacted with institutional structures over time. Policies, systems, and symbols generated by the group, or groups within the institution were theorized as manifestations of culture and in turn, constituitive of culture. Barriers and strategies to effect change at the institutional level were viewed as aspects of the group/exterior dimension of organizational life.

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework

	INTERIOR	EXTERIOR
INDIVIDUAL	(Who am I?) • Dialogic self • Values, assumptions, Beliefs • Dual identity: feminist/ Disciplinary scholar *Creative tension: compromise - contradiction*	(What is my experience within a department? Discipline? The center?) • Tenure • Publishing • Leadership • Socialization • Research opportunities • Communication • Service • Support • Community building *Creative tension: marginalized - integrated*
GROUP	(Who are we?) • Internal changes In the feminist community on campus • shifts in priorities (department, discipline, center) *Creative tension: divisiveness - unity in diversity*	(What is the role of the center on campus? What progress have we made?) • What structural issues/changes has it promoted? • How does it contribute to career development for faculty? • Visibility • Relations with society • Administrative support *Creative tension: cultural home for feminists - catalyst for transformation* (Safarik, 2000)

Open-ended and semi-structured interviews were the primary data collection method used in the research. Interview guides were developed based on the theoretical and conceptual frameworks. Four topics, corresponding to the dimensions of transformation illustrated in Figure 1, were explored with each participant. They

included: 1) development of a feminist consciousness; 2) development as a scholar; 3) involvement with the Center for the Study of Women; and 4) experiences at UCLA and in their department. All interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed by the researcher. Each participant was interviewed between two and four times; interviews were between one and three hours long. All participants provided their curriculum vitae. These and other relevant documents (e.g. speeches, autobiographical sketches) were analyzed for information about the participant's scholarly interests, career choices, educational background, and the extent to which their work was interdisciplinary, collaborative, and included community-building.

Data Analysis

Throughout data collection, data were analyzed using a constant comparative approach in which emerging theories were constantly modified and elaborated as incoming data were played against them (Strauss & Corbin, 1994, p.273). Data analysis was inductive and included iterative cycles of coding to elicit themes and patterns from the data in order to build a grounded theory of feminist institutional transformation (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Narrative analysis was used as a tool to extract worldviews, values, perspectives, dialogic moments, and meaning-making systems from the stories (Riessman, 1993; Josselson & Lieblich, 1993).

Data display matrixes were created to reduce the large amounts of data from the interviews and documents into a format which facilitated analysis at individual and across-individual levels (Miles & Huberman, 1994). A matrix for each of the four quadrant coding categories was formed by juxtaposing participant names with the

emergent data subcategories. This analytic strategy made it easier to see patterns and themes and also provided a system for indexing the data.

Several methods were used to ensure the trustworthiness of the data. An audit trail, in which data sources of data and the process used for developing the analysis are easily traced, was facilitated by the use of the conceptual framework and matrixes as described above. Interview data were triangulated with data from the curriculum vitae and other published materials. Finally, participants had the opportunity to review the data analysis and to critique the researcher's interpretations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) to determine authenticity.

Results

This paper focuses on one aspect of the study, examining the development of feminist scholars in sociohistoric context and the integral role of individual consciousness in the process of institutional transformation.Sociohistoric context, family background, educational influences, and important human relationships provided a frame of reference from which the participants constructed narratives about their development as feminist scholars. Their career/life stories provided insights about the ways in which they made sense of their worlds. These meaning-making systems shape and are shaped by the institution at multiple levels in the process of institutional transformation.

Group Profile

Participants were faculty from the departments of sociology, anthropology, psychology, English, art history, history, communications studies, and from the professional schools of law and urban planning. Five of the nine participants were full professors, including one adjunct full professor, one was an associate professor, and three

were assistant professors. Their ages ranged from 32 to 61, with four older than 50, three between 39 and 48, and two in their early thirties. The participants also varied with respect to when they came to UCLA, and therefore in affiliation with the Center for the Study of Women (CSW) which was established in 1984. This information locates the experience of the scholar within the historical development of the institutionalization of academic scholarship at UCLA. Only two predated the CSW; one came as early as 1973; the other in 1982. Three others came during the first few years of the Center's establishment, between 1986 and 1988. The remaining four were relative newcomers, coming to UCLA after 1994.

In terms of the group profile, certain aspects of their identity deserve discussion because they foreground the analysis in important ways. One male was intentionally selected as a participant for the purpose of understanding the issues related to the inclusion and perspectives of men in feminist scholarship. Three of the nine participants are from self-reported working class or poor families of origin, and the remaining six are from the middle or upper-middle classes. All of the participants are white except one, who is Latina. Representing women of color in the sample was a key concern during sample selection. Of the twenty-four faculty contacted based on the sampling criteria, seven were women of color, but only one of the women of color agreed to participate.

It is significant that all of the faculty who responded and declined to participate, did so with the explanation that they were overextended despite their support of the study as a "worthy project." In particular, several of the women of color engaged in a protracted dialogue with me about the exact nature and demands of the study and indicated to me that they were conflicted about whether or not to participate. In the

course of my interview with the one woman of color who did agree to participate, she explained her own tactic in responding to my invitation. She admittedly made me "jump through some hoops" requesting I send various documents and respond to methodological questions about my research in the hope that I might "back-off." She explained this approach as a screening mechanism she uses to protect her time. The issue of "triple duty" or the multiple demands of women of color who cope with the demands of their individual research and community building in feminist and ethnic studies spheres, emerged as a salient theme in the analysis. The lack of representation of women of color in the research, then, becomes more than a methodological issue; instead, it has implications for understanding institutional transformation that were addressed in the larger study.

Interestingly, of the seven participants who are married, have ever been married, or who are in a committed relationships, all have or had academic partners, two have children who are academics, and two have parents (or a primary caretaker) who were academics. Seven had either one or two children; one was a single parent. The high frequency of academic couples even in this small sample, portends inquiry into the relationship between family choices and arrangements, the feminist commitment, and being a woman in the academy. Further, the group differed as to when they had their children in relation to tenure, with the senior and older cohort having tended to have children after or simultaneously with being granted tenure and the younger and junior subgroup having their children prior to tenure.

The questions raised by these personal data, are addressed in the ensuing analysis; issues of family and career figure prominently in the results of the larger study. The story

of their academic lives cannot be told without reference to their familial relationships, decisions about having children, and how they manage to balance their work and home lives. In part, they assessed the impact of feminism on the academy in terms of how their family lives have intersected with issues related to hiring, promotion, and tenure and how their students are affected by work and family issues.

The Impact of the Women's Movement

Expectedly, given the range of the ages of these individuals, the second wave of feminism had differing impacts on their lives and careers. In revisiting the late 60's and early 70's, these feminists illustrated how this time of political ferment shaped their identities and value systems in profound ways. The sociohistoric dimension of these lives revealed the impetus for their roles in institutional transformation and laid groundwork for assessing the range of vision these individuals bring to the work of transformation.

The participants were clustered in four groups according to their age at the time the women's movement had acquired momentum and was first becoming institutionalized in higher education. In 1970, three were mature adults (ages 29,31,34); two were young adults (ages 19,25); two were adolescents (ages 10,12); and two were young children (ages 1,6). Within these age groups, there were distinct differences between individuals with regard to the nature and extent of the impact of the women's movement on their academic careers. Differences related to class, family background, religion, and generation had different effects on how these individuals interpreted feminism, and act as change agents in the transformative process.

Theories about links between sociocultural context and personal development can be used to enhance our understanding about the origins of various ideological perspectives of the individuals who do scholarly work in our universities. In examining the impact of the women's movement on various age cohorts, Stewart (1994) considered the different ways individuals' identities, vocations, and life choices were shaped depending on their developmental stage at the time they experienced it. In applying this general framework to my study, several consistencies were evident.

The participants who were mature adults in 1970 (ages 29, 31and 34), experienced the women's movement in unique ways. All three of these women were among the pioneers of the women's movement in academe and were among the first to challenge academic normative culture. One was actively pursuing an academic career when the women's movement began; the other two struggled with the decision to become academics as they engaged in political work outside of the academy. The differing impact that experience had on their academic careers and roles as transformative agents reinforces Stewart's finding that indeed, this historical event had the power to invoke radical changes in the way these individual's saw the world and lived their lives.

The movement provided the impetus for one scholar to initiate change from within the institution where she had already established her career and professional identity. She used her knowledge of and power within the institution to effect changes that incorporated feminist knowledge. In this brief summary of her fast-track career as an academic/activist while at Stanford University, conveyed an image of drive, productivity, and personal sacrifice was conveyed. After receiving her undergraduate degree at

Pembroke and her Ph.D. from Columbia in comparative literature, she got her first teaching job at Stanford at age 25 in 1966:

> . . . so I taught at Stanford for twenty years, went through the ranks—assistant, associate, full, then endowed professor—and then I came here because my husband was teaching down here and we'd been commuting between Stanford and UCLA for ten years and we had a child and wanted to end that as soon as possible.

Her early career coincided with the post-Vietnam War era and the height of the women's movement. As a leader in the movement to get ROTC moved off campus, she was also actively engaged in the foundational work of institutionalizing feminism:

> I was on the early committees at Stanford to try to get equal rights for women faculty and equal pay for equal work which was a real problem there then--faculty day-care facilities institutionalized, maternity leave-- all sorts of things they didn't have when I arrived in 1966.

She described how she collaborated with other feminists at Stanford between 1970 and 1975, to develop a "feminist studies" program and the Center for Research on Women (CROW). After a few years as founding director the Center for Research on Women at Stanford, she left for UCLA. On the whole, she experienced collegial support and respect at Stanford. She attributed this to her increasing visibility as a campus leader, but also to "paternalistic" good will toward women's inclusion and a general climate of "liberal guilt:"

> I found the institution in many ways oddly supportive . . and they actually helped me a lot to get through the tenure process and then actually when I started agitating to get rid of ROTC and bring issues concerning women to the table, people were willing to listen. I mean there was a lot of liberal guilt there that one could draw on because it was a smaller institution and in some ways if I would have stayed there I would have been a dean--I would have been a real academic power. I didn't want to do that necessarily but they clearly respected me--I was getting put on all the major committees at the University at a relatively early age and so they were willing to listen (II:3).

However, she recalled some resistance to her promotion and tenure by particular male colleagues whom she felt resented the early accomplishments of a "younger woman faculty member:"

> When I came up for tenure I think I was actually held up for a year at Stanford because the senior male colleague in my field attacked me. But I wasn't even doing feminist work then, I was working on William Blake and he just didn't like me and didn't like having a young woman who was a more successful teacher than he was in the department. And so it was a very ad hominum, ad feminum attack-- not a politically or even an intellectually motivated attack--although it kind of masqueraded as an intellectual critique. But my colleagues really stood by me then and . . . I had to delay it all for a year but they actually got it through for the following year.

She experienced a similar reaction from a male dean when she came up for full-professor. When she appealed this discriminatory action, she received this "negotiated response:"

> . . . 'you're right, he did discriminate against you on two factual, empirical accounts, but we don't want to embarrass him by promoting you, so we'll give you the raise, but promote you the following year.'

Because she had been publishing "much, much more than [her] male colleagues at comparable stages," her career did not suffer; she referred to her case as "the classic, 'I got ahead by being better'..." but was aware of women who "did experience a lot of discrimination, both at Stanford and other institutions." When she came to UCLA, weary of the emotional strain of a ten-year commuter marriage, she continued her work to institutionalize feminism on campus. Her experience at Stanford had permanently altered the direction her own scholarship; from this point on, she decided she would "always do [her] research on feminist issues."

The other two senior participants were among the feminists who charted a new career path in academe. Impassioned by political concerns outside of the academy, and struggling with personal issues in their family lives, these women moved in and out of

academe as they formulated their feminist identities and shaped the growing movement in unique ways. As re-entry graduate students, these women were among the generation who broke tradition by starting an academic career in their mid-thirties. One benefited from the Danforth fellowship, which she described as the "analogue to the GI bill."[2] They both completed their doctorates in 1979, one at age 40 and the other at age 41.

Valuing the pursuit of knowledge and the social power it inheres, they nonetheless questioned the culture and structures of an institution that seemed to reproduce the oppressive social conditions about which they had become painfully aware. Looking for and creating options which made sense in their evolving worldview, they remained ambivalent about an academic career:

> And then about the time I figured out what academia was about, I had doubts, which was when I was a radical in graduate school, it was in a sense too late to back out--I had invested too much time and I couldn't think of anything else to do--anything that was any better. The whole world, any country that was involved, to me, in Vietnam at that time was a totally corrupt country and there were no good jobs, there were no moral jobs, and so academia seem the lesser of all the evils.

Another who chose a non-traditional path, spent ten years "betwix and between" academia, enjoying the counter-culture lifestyle of the 1960's in the San Francisco Bay area and debating her commitment to active political struggle against her intellectual interests. Her marriage to a graduate student at Stanford further complicated her plans:

> When we got married, I decided that I would not go to graduate school . . . I would do other things and think more about what I really wanted to do my

[2] The Danforth fellowships at this time, targeted women who had interrupted their education and returned to graduate school at least three years after completing their bachelor's degree. This initiative was a corrective measure; Danforth had cut funding for women during the fifties, based on the assumptions that women's completion rate was lower than men's. The fellowships were reinstated in the early sixties for re-entry women when further analysis revealed that when a correction was made for women's alternative educational trajectory, their completion rates matched or exceeded men's. Danforth's "guilt" fellowship symbolized the heightened awareness of gender equity in higher education at the time. (From an interview with Sandra Harding, 1/29/98).

> dissertation on and then when he finished his dissertation and got his first job then I would go to school. And . . ., sort of cheerfully we were saying that he was more ambitious than I was or that I enjoyed the intellectual process of doing the research but that he was the more career-oriented person and this all seemed normal and appropriate way to talk about gender and so forth (II:36).

She dealt with the decision to pursue an academic career and other important life choices during this period through participation in several consciousness-raising groups. She acknowledged the now cliché status of this early movement practice, but believes the insights she gained through participation in these "CR" groups profoundly shaped her life choices:

> It was 66. . . . later at Rutgers I started graduate school and that's . . . when I first started CR group. . . .And what surprised me at the time was finding all these people who I did not feel I had a lot in common with actually I did have a lot in common with. And that's the sort of cliché of consciousness-raising groups-- that you figure out those things. . . . .but it felt really quite powerful at the time as everybody says. And the intense discussions about what it meant as a woman to deal with the situation at the time. . . .changing society and changing our own opportunities immediately.

When she returned to the Bay area in 1970, there appeared finally to be a place for her in academe. The advent of the "free university scene" coincided with what she referred to as her "third phase of graduate school" and it proved to be the right fit. It was in another CR group that she worked through her decision to commit to an academic career:

> And all of us decided to go back to school and all of us are academics now--but we were not at all sure that we wanted to be academics. We just felt really impatient in our work lives and felt that without more degrees we would always be in some kind of glorified clerical positions vis-a-vis somebody else's projects, no matter what kind of projects they were or what kind of organizations. And we were getting a little impatient and we felt that the degrees would help us and so we all went back to school.

Having decided to go back to graduate school, she became involved with "science for the people" as a way to bridge her political commitments with a viable line of inquiry. Her eventual decision to study the physics community was grounded in a value of collaboration and in a skepticism about exclusionary practices in the academic world. Her experiences with collective action outside of the academy had stimulated her thinking about the group dynamics of change. The seemingly egalitarian atmosphere of the physics lab and the fact that it was an all-male social environment, further intrigued her:

> I had a couple of reasons for being interested in studying a community, one is . . . that they were making knowledge in a group. And all my academic experience had been people working alone and in this more monastic tradition of knowledge making. . . I was living in a commune at that time and very committed to various kinds of collective action whether it was about anti-war activities or about social change and about consciousness raising groups. . . So trying to understand both how groups could be receptive and actors for change and groups could on some level resist change was really a major curiosity for me.

She attended the newly established "History of Consciousness" program at the University of California, Santa Cruz, intrigued by its innovative structure and the ideas of the faculty whose theoretical disposition resonated with her own growing interest in the studying the physics community. In particular, she recalled making an important intellectual connection with one faculty member:

> He said, "there are always competing versions of the past whenever there are competing versions of the future." And I thought, "wow that's kind of interesting. A theory, you know." I said, "you mean there's a direct correlation between the version of the past and the version of the future so that all of the people with you know...." he said, "Yes, it all falls into place." I immediately was both fascinated and wanted to challenge it and so forth.

Another feminist from this generational cohort, who was similarly ambivalent about an academic career, described the integration of class consciousness in her

development as a feminist scholar. She recalled how, as a young girl she learned about gender and class through her mother's "mixed messages:"

> I think all of us feminists at least of our generation realize that we were always independent strong women, who didn't get messed with. . . . Whether that was because we had strong women role models in our lives or whatever it was, but in my case it was because of my mother with all of her mixed messages. On the one hand . . . --she was married five times by the way--she was the central bread earner of the family all the way through. She was the one who held us together. But she was also someone who was very male identified and she had really horrible taste in men (laughing). And was a kind of weak person in that regard. But out in the public world, she was very strong and she had worked her way up from nothing to a pretty good job in advertising. . . .But I think I learned early that women work for wages outside the home--there's no question about that, you do it. And I think I learned that you don't have to have children. You know, mother described childbirth to me in a (laughing) way that was so unappealing, . . . somehow or other she made me see that children were an enormous burden and not this you know, great gift . . . So you start to put all those things together in both those good and bad examples and you get someone who says, well I'm not going to have any part of this. I'm never going to be dependent on a man.

From these contradictory images of her mother, she learned to value independence rather than romantic fantasies about motherhood and marriage. Her developing feminist consciousness was conflicted by a desire to conform to constructions of femininity that were reinforced by her mother. She eventually resolved this conflict in a marriage to a like-minded man: "I don't think that the divisions between masculinity and femininity have a lot of meaning to him. I've actually not met many people like him."

Equally important as the lessons her mother instilled in her, was a strong desire to lift herself out of her working-class life. She framed her love of the arts, her academic aspirations, and her marriage in terms of the pursuit of "respectability:"

> My mother constructed a middle class for me and she told me everything that she knew. And I don't know where she got her ideas, this kid from the slums of Des Moines in Chicago. She had some notion of what kind of alcohol you should order if you're at a cocktail party if you're a real lady. You know if you smoke, which I never did in my life, but how to smoke, how to dress (that obviously

> didn't take . . . .) She was a very beautiful, extremely glamorous woman, within her class, that is. But anyway she constructed this middle-class for me that involved a stilted way of talking--she made sure I had diction lesson, elocution lessons--stilted table manners. . . my mother thought another way that I could probably pass as middle-class, (although of course she never said it that way,) was to learn literature and art. So she sent me . . ., to the one and only art gallery in Des Moines. And I did the same when I went to Omaha for high school. I went around the art gallery and learned every single one of the paintings and who did it and studied them and so forth. . . . And so once again this was my path to respectability. If I knew high culture nobody, then, could question where I was in terms of the American class system.

The first in her family to go to college, she got her bachelor's degree, two master's and a doctorate degree from UCLA, and then continuing her "path to social respectability" by marrying a university professor.

Like other activist/feminist/scholars of this generation, she was a "leftist radical on campus and off." Frustrated with the dominance of male leadership in the organizations she participated in, she felt unable to rebel: "And I certainly didn't feel that I had any reason to challenge the leadership of black men who had been kept down for so long, for obvious reasons." A confirmed Marxist, she left for Sudan in 1971 to complete her dissertation research where a young Sudanese woman was influential in her development as a feminist:

> She was a confirmed radical feminist, and I was a confirmed radical socialist Marxist. And we locked horns and had just hours and hours and hours, days long discussions about politics and by the time I left Sudan in that particular period, I was rethinking my Marxism. When she and I reconverged a year later, she had joined the Sudanese Communist Party and I had become a feminist. So it was kind of funny, so after a while . . she became my best friend, and we came together calling ourselves socialist feminists--to satisfy us.

When she finally returned to the States in 1975, with two adopted Eritrean daughters, she remembers feeling that the country had changed significantly in those few short years:

> I stepped back into a U.S. that was in . . . the peak of the second wave feminism and you know in my mind, it was as if I stepped off the plane and I was in a different world. And it didn't take much to raise my consciousness, I mean it had already been raised by my friend, but I hadn't applied it to the U.S. situation. But all of my really close friends that I had left years before were all in women's groups--well women's groups--that was something new to me entirely. So I joined a women's group which was not a political group, but which was one of those support groups, --didn't like it much, because I didn't know how to act, I didn't know the rules. But then I started taking a bunch of workshops on feminism, on the women's movement. And from then on, everything that I read had to do with feminism. So I gave myself really a crash course, an intensive course in feminism.

She recalled applying for a position to teach a founding women's studies course in anthropology at California State University, Northridge as "one of the boldest things I'd ever done." It was personally transformative:

> But no one had any background in women's studies, there wasn't any women's studies. My first introduction to women's studies class, . . . was my one of the great experiences in my life. I mean, talk about students who take their first women's studies class, who claim that it changed their life--Well teaching my first course changed my life.

Academic feminism, then an oxymoron, provided a solution to the moral conflict she felt beginning a career in what appeared to be a corrupt institution and rescued her from an intellectual impasse. The appeal of feminist scholarship was threefold; it made sense personally, politically, and theoretically. Assimilating a new worldview was a process in which one's identity cohered, but one's life was disrupted:

> And I began to realize that certain patriarchal aspects of my family life. I had always thought of [her husband] as a completely egalitarian guy just because he was gentle and we made decisions together and so on. But I began to realize all kinds of things about my family life. And so I was struggling there . . . and struggling within academia and struggling in the street so to speak. But women's studies at that time in my life must have been absolutely perfect. Because it gave me some sense that there was that there could be meaning in the ideas that I was learning and espousing in academia. That theoretical ideas could make a change in people's lives. That we could create a link between community and the academy. (II:28)

Her perspective on institutionalizing academic feminism contrasted with that of her counterpart who was instrumental in establishing CROW and feminist studies at Stanford. Whereas one found she could tap into the community's "liberal guilt" for support and used the extant power structure to enact a feminist culture, the other viewed feminism as a "rebellious creature in the belly of the beast." She relished her role in this provocative movement, for it renewed her hope in social change and fulfilled her need for a personally meaningful vocation:

> [Women's studies] was perfect for me because it was just one more way that I could sort of thumb my nose at the establishment. Women's studies was a thorn in the side of the administration--it was--as I viewed it at the time . . . a rebellious creature within the belly of the beast and nothing could have made me any happier than that. I was constantly thumbing my nose at authority and this was just another way that we could do it. And we could do it in a way that gave us a site, . . . to do that. I now recognize that as a kind of institutionalization that has a kind of deadening effect. But at the time I thought "this is great, I can be right in the belly of the beast, I can do what it is that I like to do, which is teach and write and so on, but I can be rebellious at the same time."

But in her early career experiences, she found the institution unready for feminist transformation as she envisioned it. Soon after receiving her Ph.D., she was hired to direct a newly established women's studies program at California State University, Long Beach. At forty-one, this new Ph.D. found herself embattled in a clash of feminist principles with traditional academic culture:

> Basically we had this radical, grassroots program. We insisted on living out the kinds of ideas that feminism within the academy was supposed to be about. We wanted to run our own program; we wanted not to have a head of the program; we wanted to run everything by consensus. We didn't want to be accountable to the administration for anything. We did not want to have a program that was staffed completely by academics, we wanted to bring people in from the community--the head of the feminist women's health center, the people who ran shelters, we wanted to have women like that come in and teach our classes. So that was our

> distinct link, we didn't draw a distinct line between community and academy. (II/IE:1)

Her experience in this "grassroots" feminist program was not unlike other early efforts to institutionalized feminism, that "shot themselves in the foot:"

> There were some others, mainly less prestigious institutions. These were the early programs--Cal State Long Beach, Cal State San Diego which was one of the early ones, with Marilyn Boxer . . . . they shot themselves in the foot, pretty much. . . They decided that they couldn't do their work within the academy. . . they got increasingly radical, ...basically a whole bunch of socialist feminists, decided that their job should be at the point of production and so they all resigned their jobs and went into working-class professions and I think tried to keep their link with the academy. . . . basically it meant . . . almost the demise of the program and then the administration brought in more academic people. I think that was about the point that Boxer came in and was head of the program. She was a very progressive person, but she was not one of those leftist radicals who shot herself in the foot. So there were programs like San Diego. . . that really tried to put some of these principles in effect in the academy. (II/IE:1-2)

For these three feminists, who were adults at the time of the second-wave of the feminist movement, development as feminist scholars was similar in that their feminism was an outgrowth of broader concerns for civil rights and that they experienced the power of group consciousness-raising and collective action as a way to effect social change. They differed, however, in their perspectives about and approaches to institutionalizing change in the academy. The first, who pursued an academic career without interruption and who was at an advanced stage in her career in the early 1970's, built upon existing structures and values within academe to include women and feminist scholarship. The others, whose feminism developed outside as well as inside the academy and who received their doctoral training in their late thirties, were more skeptical of the foundational values of the academy. They perceived feminism as a radical challenge to the core knowledge production processes. Whereas the traditional academic experienced

the women's movement as intellectually transformative, her nontraditional generational counterparts, underwent personal as well as intellectual transformations. This radicalized worldview, enlarged their vision for transforming the academy.

The task for the young adults who were in graduate school during this time period, was to assimilate newly emerging ideas about knowledge production with the traditional academic discourse within which they were being trained. Two participants were in undergraduate and graduate school in 1970; one was 19 and completing his bachelor's degree at UCLA; the other was a graduate student at Harvard at age 25. Both were studying psychology and experienced the women's movement as an intellectually transformative experience. The questions being raised by the movement were incorporated into their early academic choices which subsequently determined the course of their research careers.

One recalled the influence of the civil rights movement during her undergraduate years and how the women's movement altered her intellectual course:

> I was intrigued by social psychology and in particular by civil rights issues because I graduated from college in 1968, so the civil rights push was very much in evidence and I had, as a college student, participated in one of the bus trips to Alabama and marched in some and done that. So I was really involved in that and saw social psychology as a way to bring about change. At least that was my hope. And I had been very impressed in college by a book that we read in a social psychology course by Tom Pedigrew called Profiled Negro American which was one of the first books on sort of race relations issues . So I decided to go to Harvard, if they would let me in, and study race relations.

When she arrived at Harvard in 1968 as a graduate student, she found an innovative program which was gender balanced (in terms of students) and which combined various specializations within psychology:

> And I think it really was a program that encouraged many of us who came out of it to have interdisciplinary, or cross-disciplinary interests and the first year some of the core seminars that we took were taken by all fifty of us whether you were in sociology or anthro and really covered the breadth of those fields. So it was quite an unusual graduate program. It was wonderful.

But the social conditions of this period of civil rights activism led her to rethink her choice of research focus:

> Partly what seemed to be going on when I arrived in 1968, especially in Boston. . . African Americans were starting to say, I'm tired of white people studying us. Why don't you do something else? Leave us alone. Let us do our thing. Some of the faculty at Harvard were having problems with conducting research with African American kids for instance, because of community opposition and fears and a whole slew of things so I was starting to think, gee, maybe that's not the right topic.

The newly emerging women's movement provided an attractive alternative. Participation in a consciousness-raising group with fellow graduate students at Harvard and the arrival of Zick Rubin, a young professor who had just finished his dissertation on romantic love at Michigan, helped her find a "personally-relevant" niche. She joined him on a NSF funded project to study couples longitudinally, launching what would become a career-long interest in relationships and gender roles, or what was called "sex roles" at this time. Her research in the newly emerging area of "sex differences" helped her land her first academic job at UCLA in 1973. She remains on the social psychology faculty today in a community of "extraordinarily supportive" colleagues.

For another who was had begun his research as an undergraduate in a senior honors program the external influence of the women's movement captured his interest and offered new insights about how to apply the research methodology he was learning in

the lab. The work of feminists Susan Brownmiller and Diana Russell were influential in forming his initial scholarly interests:

> And at the time there was a lot of controversy going on about images of sex and violence in the media and related issues of rape and so on that were coming from feminist theory and to me those were in many ways more interesting ideas.... For example, there was a famous advertisement at the time from the Rolling Stones that had this kind of woman who was scantily clad and who was tied and said, "I'm black and blue from the Rolling Stones and I love it." And a women's group had kind of plastered it with blood, it was actually paint of course, and there was a controversy about issues of first amendment, issues of women's rights, and because I had been introduced to that area, but was somewhat dissatisfied with it, I would say I made the link... This was an aspect of that area that really spoke to what I saw was important, social issues. So I decided to try and take some of those ideas and debates about whether these kinds of images do or do not effect men's attitudes and the way people behave in social relationships and try to translate them in testable ideas or testable hypotheses using some of the methodology I was learning at the time in the lab and bringing those two together.

Study male sexual aggression and the media from a feminist perspective was not his primary focus at first:

> . . . but interestingly the work related more to issues of sexual portrayal of women in the media, sexual violence, in many ways "paid-off" much better. The studies showed some pretty, what many people considered, dramatic findings--they were controversial at the time, you know--the first set of supposedly empirical studies in that area, that got a lot of criticism and a lot praise depending on the political orientation of the people reading them, and so I felt compelled to pursue the studies, to address some of the criticisms and it became much more the main focus of my research--not so much because I planned it that way, but because there was a momentum generated both in terms of paying off, in terms of acceptance in terms of publication, becoming a focal point for criticism and praise and that led to a momentum. I continued to do the research, got some research grants to support it, so these kinds of things that gave the research a continued impetus that eventually became my main area of focus . . .

His professor, interested in psychoanalytic approaches to the topic, provided minimal guidance; instead, his work caught the attention of the radical feminist community:

> And I was invited, that in itself was pretty controversial, in that I, a man, was being invited to give talks to these groups that some people perceived --I didn't really experience, by and large--as being hostile to men. They were very much encouraging certain continued studies . . .(II:33)

Research designed to raise consciousness about violence against women resonated with is own sense of social responsibility and inclination to "challenge the mainstream," but he acknowledged that "the timing was right" for pursuing this line of inquiry. His training in experimental methodology combined with a socially-relevant and provocative issues in ways that "paid off" for this young scholar.

Unlike their older colleagues, these two professors who received their doctoral training as young adults in the early 1970s did not experience feminism as intellectually or personally troubling. Their colleagues in social psychology were sympathetic to social justice issues including the emerging feminist issues and these scholars easily adapted the tools of their discipline to feminist inquiry. In fact, the momentum gathered during this period of emerging feminist scholarship provided a climate in which these scholars benefitted considerably by pursuing a feminist research agenda.

These participants viewed feminist scholarship as a broadening enhancement of the extant structures and although they worked to institutionalize academic feminism, they did not experience resistance from within their discipline or personal conflict about the nature and process of knowledge production as a consequence of doing feminist research. Later in their careers, however, both of these feminist expressed concern with the tendency within some academic feminist circles, as they perceived it, to "dictate proper methods and thinking" and towards "extreme social constructivist approaches to research."

Two participants were in the formative period of early adolescence in 1970; they were 10 and 12 years old. Through the eighties, they experienced the changes brought about by the women's movement through the media and were being raised to reject traditional roles for women. These women's first experience of the women's movement was filtered through adolescent eyes. Issues of self-image and expectations for the future about career and motherhood were prominent in one participant's recollection of this phase in her development:

> First of all, I was a teenager in the 70s and that's a moment when the women's movement became very visible in the national scene. I think I was very impacted by the burn-the-bra, don't wear makeup, the natural self that hasn't been manipulated by advertising and so forth. At the same time--pursue a professional career, don't get married and have children. I've done both (laughs) and even wear makeup (laughs) but basically I had sort of an equal rights ideology at that point.

By the time this professor was an undergraduate in 1977, feminist courses were available, thus, enabling her to articulate her developing feminist consciousness intellectually. As a graduate student and as a young professor, the mentorship of feminist scholars was pivotal in shaping her intellectual interests:

> . . .so I'd say in both cases the mentors simply were people who were very supportive and caring and nurturing on some levels. So that was really important to me in my development. . . . And then . . . I taught for a year at Duke before coming here. They have a very strong women's studies program. At that time Signs was published there. And the women who ran that program, Jean O'Barr really reached out to me and there were and are a number of important feminist scholars there.

Rather than a "CR" group, it was through a reading group with her first graduate students at UCLA, that she developed an interest in issues of gender and consumer culture, the subject of her second book.

For another, who was 10 years old in 1970, a deep concern for social justice originated from her Jewish heritage. Because her father was a Holocaust survivor, she developed a strong activist-orientation; in retrospect, she cannot separate her feminist consciousness from a more generalized equal rights ideology:

> I've always been interested in issues of inequality. I'm a daughter of a Holocaust survivor, so that's always had a huge influence on my personal life but also what I think about, what I want to do in life. So I've always been sort of an activist-oriented. Now how that translated specifically into sort of a feminist consciousness, I don't know where that link was, but clearly I've always been interested in inequality and gender inequality as well. . . . And it probably goes back to adolescence, high school, I guess. So I have worked on gender issues for a long time in different kinds of capacities. As an undergraduate I wrote a thesis on women and political representation. That was in the early 1980s. I did work on domestic violence and rape issues as an activist. And I don't know, . . . how it really translated into oppression and equality and gender.

The intensely personal experience of oppression with which she grew up, profoundly shaped her identity:

> It's actually not necessarily a Jewish issue, it's an issue of oppression in general. So you know it's something that was always present. It's not something that you choose. It's part of my life ...and my whole network of friends are survivors, it's part of day-to-day life. I think from very early on I was very conscious of not being included, of feeling hurt, feeling all of this stuff.

She recalls participating in a version of the feminist consciousness-raising group, "Daughters of Survivors," in which she shared "a lot of common experiences in terms of personal, home-life stuff, but also activism as well." It seems that her inclination to bond with other women was taken-for-granted, as was her awareness of social injustices; this perspective is likely to be a product of the pervasive influence of feminist discourse during her formative years:

> I always had extremely close relationships with women, but there's no real specific turning point where you know some people say, "oh there was this situation that all of a sudden I sort of saw things through this gender lens. . . That

> wasn't really the case, you know I can't really say there was a time when I didn't think about these issues of inequality and gender inequality . . .

These two women, were among the first generation to be raised with expectations that they would be "career women." For one, whose both parents were academics, her direction was clear; as she describes it:

> . . .so I grew up in an academic community and you might say that I never left the academy--I don't know the world beyond the academy, that is always where I have felt most comfortable.

Her generational counterpart, an activist, took a different career path. She spent ten years directing a grassroots lobbying campaign, a voter registration drive in a poor community, and as a research analyst for a hotel and restaurant employees union, before returning to graduate school. She too had taken women's studies courses as an undergraduate, but for her, it was her experiences out in the world that helped shaped her scholarly interests. She returned to graduate school in her early thirties. After completing her master's degree in Urban Planning, she wanted more and enrolled in a Ph.D. program. As a professor, her research focuses on the intersection of social, welfare, and labor market policy.

For those who were young adolescents in 1970, the effect of the women's movement was mixed. By the time they received their doctoral training in the late eighties and nineties, feminist scholarship had proliferated and was legitimized to the point that these participants experienced little difficulty in integrating their feminist values in their work. But because they had been impacted by the women's movement at time when their gender identity was being formed, they struggled more in their personal lives with preconditioned assumptions about motherhood and careers and the intellectual

understandings they had internalized as feminists. Interestingly, both women started families in their mid-thirties; the former after tenure, the later while completing her doctorate. Both spoke extensively about their struggles to maintain egalitarian arrangements in their homes, despite their marriage to academic partners who share in childcare and household responsibilities, and discussed their feminist identity in relation to balancing motherhood and an academic career. These issues are further developed in the larger study, and are salient in the stories of most of the participants; however, the relative significance of this part of their lives is likely to be related to the sociohistoric context of their development as feminists.

The scholars who were young children during the early 1970's inherited a broad set of expectations about social justice from the women's movement and the overall climate of sensitivity to issues of inequality that characterized the historical moment. For the two participants who were young children at this historical moment, (one and six years old), the impact of the women's movement was felt through the lives of their parents. In reconstructing stories of how they acquired feminist values, they spoke of "taken-for-granted" assumptions based on what they observed in their homes as children. For one, gender inequality was played out in her parent's relationship; however, her feminist consciousness developed simultaneously with class consciousness:

> Well I guess at some point in college it got articulated as feminist. I mean in my house it was obvious that there were inequalities for men and women. My dad was an electrician and was a high school drop-out and this wasn't even my biological dad. But my mom taught for a little while and then she was a full-time homemaker, and then she got some different jobs, I don't know, it was just very ...ob-vi-ous to me. I'd say growing up class was so much more important to me because we had so many problems with finances. We were basically working-class or poor depending on what point in time you stopped by. No, I don't remember any sort of eureka moment.

At 28, she received her Ph.D. from Northwestern University in sociology. Her research focuses on women in the military--a career move, she explained, that was not altogether intentional:

> I sort of side-stepped into it, I was a teaching assistant –I arranged to be a teaching assistant for Charles Moskos, who's the top military sociologist in the country. Because my undergraduate degree was in European and Soviet Studies, I had studied and traveled through Eastern Europe. And at the time he was getting a lot of invitations to go over there. So I wanted to be his TA because I wanted to keep up on the news of what was going on. So at one point he had an invitation to go to Russia and I said, 'hey do you need a research assistant, I'll carry your bags, I'll take notes, I'll order your dinner for you in Russian.' And he said, "no, but I'm having this debate with someone and the chief of staff of the army—that's like the top dog of the army—wants me to interview some military women about this issue of combat exclusion, would you want to do some of that? So I thought, 'sure, why not?' find out what those crazy women were thinking when they joined the army. . . And it sort of turned into a career I hadn't planned on and I loved talking to military people. I had a lot of stereotypes that were immediately blown away and it was really a fascinating site to look at gender because that's where some of the really hard issues about biology versus social construction are really confronted so . . . I loved it and just happened to fall into it.

Although feminist work had been integral in her graduate program, this particular chain of events precipitated by the invitation from a male mentor to join his research project, led her to carve out a niche as an important voice in the feminist dialogue about women in the military. It was through her research, in which she interacted with people in the military and with leaders in this traditionally male-dominated area of research and public policy, that she confronted fundamental theoretical questions in feminist inquiry. The experience of conducting research with real people in an environment to which she had had little previous exposure was transformative for her. Her value of research that is meaningful in the everyday lives of people and her penchant for critically examining stereotypes emerged from these early experiences as a scholar.

Another, who grew up in a working-class Chicana neighborhood in Albuquerque, was raised by parents who were active in the social movements of the time. For her, feminism was instilled as a fundamental value:

> Both my parents would call themselves feminists. . . . That was just part of the whole package of liberal ideas and sort of progressive ideas about the world--women's equality, blacks' equality. So Gloria Steinem was just someone I took for granted as someone who we owed a lot to. You know we had Ms. Magazine around the house when I was growing up. . . . So I think that was just part of the political culture that I was raised in. And then and I guess the personal dimension of it was that my mother was definitely part of that generation whose life was changed . . . Whereas I grew up with taking it for granted.

It wasn't until later when she entered the elite world of places like Harvard, Stanford, and UCLA that she recognized how impoverished her high school had been, nor did she fully understand what it meant for her parents to have been born at home, until much later when sociology gave her a language for articulating class consciousness. A significant influence on her personal development, she claims, was her father's experience of going to college. Within the socioeconomic context of her family life, this was a pivotal event:

> They were both born to large families, my mom's a child of six and my father's one of seven. They were born into extreme poverty, none of my four grandparents had more that a couple of years of formal education. Despite the fact that all three of them were U.S. citizens, . . . they were born into very poor circumstances and in some ways it was a surprise that they even graduated from high school. They were born in . . . a very segregated town. They had a black school, and a Mexican school and a white school and life was supposed to be determined by those statuses, . . . it was kind of a caste system, even as late as their childhood. My father was the only one of seven kids to graduate high school.

Subsequently joining the army and returning to unstable economic conditions in New Mexico, her father eventually worked in a War-on-Poverty program in Roswell. Upon advice from a family friend, who was working on his Ph.D., he decided to go to college.

She was three years old when her father went to the University of New Mexico on the GI Bill. Her mother, despite the heightened social awareness of the time, remained at home, caring for her and her brother, while her father went to school and worked. In this description of her childhood family life, she contrasted the range of possibilities available to her mother and father, and their different ways of expressing their political values. Her mother, as "a woman of that era and a Mexican," "didn't have a sense of possibilities" and aspired, at most, she recalled to be a secretary. However, she saw both of them as "quite politicized:"

> I was born in 64, I guess maybe I was two years old when my dad started school. . . anyway in that particular time period he was at the university during the anti-war movement and the civil rights movement. He was among the group of students at the University of New Mexico who were first organizing Mexican-American students' activities, Chicano students' activities, protests and so we've seen pictures of them where they're wearing suits and protesting . . . So they were very politicized and my mom . . . was involved with what my dad was doing politically, but she was taking care of us. But she was also quite politicized as well. So I think their politicization . . .reflected a lot on their parenting and what aspirations they had for us. Anyway my father went to University of California, Berkeley in 69. . . He was in a Ph.D. program in sociology.

Although her father never completed his doctorate, the effect of his educational experience had a long-lasting influence on his family:

> . . . the world was opened up to him in the sense of going to Berkeley, and being there with all the political stuff that was going on and of course just being at a great university-- just . . . being introduced to that culture and that sort of opportunity. So my brother and I were brought up with the idea that we had to go to college. . . . It was never a question whether we would go to college. You know other than my dad, we didn't really know that many people who had gone to college in our daily life. . . . still we assumed that we would.

Although she knew of few people who went out of state to college when she was graduating from high school, her high SAT scores and advice from a classmate who had gone on to Princeton opened up the possibility of attending an elite university. After

applying and being accepted at ten ivy league schools, she decided on Harvard and recalled "not knowing what I was in for" when she arrived in 1982. She found no Latino professors and no Chicano Studies programs. She expressed her politics through involvement in the college newspaper and found support for her interest in race issues. Having become indoctrinated with political activism as a child, she gravitated toward social justice issues including feminism, on campus.

As a woman of color, she was equally aware of race and gender issues. As one of only two women of color on the staff of the student newspaper, she worked to resist racist and sexist exclusionary practices through her journalism. By this time, women's studies courses were widely available at Harvard. Rather than actively seeking out these perspectives, understood feminist perspectives to be an integral part of the curriculum. Despite her proclivity for scholarship, a desire for practical work pulled her away from an immediate decision to go on to graduate school. Frustrated after a short stint on Capitol Hill, she merged her academic and activist interests and applied concurrently to graduate programs in sociology and law school, with ambitions to pursuing both careers:

> And then while I was there I decided to apply to graduate schools and law schools. And I was pretty turned off by Capitol Hill and by the kind of politics of money basically. I was working for a Democrat during a Republican-controlled Senate and it was pretty frustrating. We lost a lot and things I was interested in like South African stuff, apartheid stuff and . . .and it was a tough time to feel good about what the system was doing and so I think I applied to Ph.D. programs partly as a way of escaping the kind of politics of those things, but I also applied to law schools at the same time and so I promised to decide well I'll make up my mind later and it also occurred to me that I might to both.

This decision to do pursue both law and academic careers, she believes, is rooted in her personal predilection for a certain kind of marginality:

> I was basically doing them concurrently. . . And I loved that, I loved having them both--that balance ended up being the right balance for me. I thought, okay I like bringing sociology to bear on the law and I like not being just at the law school. Having my foot somewhere else and my identity split that way. So I think there is something there. That marginality--I enjoy that marginality a little bit and some people do and some people don't, but that probably has relevance to other intellectual choices that I've made and political choices as well

By the time she was a law student at Stanford in the late eighties, critical race feminism was emerging as a new legal genre (Wing, 1997) but:

> . . . there were very few women in law school teaching--a lot of students--but in terms of professors, maybe there were four or five professors, we viewed the women faculty as embattled and we viewed it as a battle going on for women generally and also for women of color specifically.

Her dissertation, which she subsequently developed into a book, focused on the politics of prenatal drug exposure, was inspired by the new scholarship by legal scholars who were looking at the "intersections of oppression." She commented on importance of these women of color in forming her own professional identity but noted that they were not on the permanent faculty:

> . . there were some really exciting visiting professors at Stanford law school, at the time that I was there. Like the best people in the whole country. In fact this turns out to be a stigma that Stanford has--the law school --that they would bring in women of color but to visit but they would never hire them. But there's now a department of labor investigation of gender discrimination going on there. So for students it was a very exciting time, cause these great names would be coming through and we would get to know them a little bit. It was really inspiring. That really helped me a lot to think of myself as a law professor. I think that that, as it happened it just became very clear to me that there was a lot of work to be done on race, class, and gender. Sort of thinking about intersections of oppression was something that I was just was naturally coming to, but that there was a lot of research to be done in that area.

For this youngest generation of feminist scholars, who are now in their early thirties, feminism is "taken-for-granted." The pervasive influence their parents'

experiences and values indoctrinated them with an expectation for social justice. With the progress made toward institutionalizing feminism in the academy, these women inherited women's studies curriculum and an increasingly sophisticated discourse of feminism and more broadly, of difference studies. These particular feminists, in part due to their working class family backgrounds, but also as a result of the contributions of feminists of color and other scholarly work in the area of the intersection of race, class, and gender, are concerned more with these more complex understandings of feminism in their own work.

Summary, Discussion, and Implications

A generational analysis of the development of these feminist scholars, clarifies how the discursive resources available at different moments within the evolution of feminism constituted their identities as scholars and feminists. The differences among this group of UCLA feminists are further explained through using a developmental framework that situates the impact of the second wave of feminism in relation to stages of personal growth. Those who were mature adults in the early seventies, essentially used their experience to institutionalize feminism in the academy. Those who were young adults in graduate school at this time, assimilated the newly emerging feminist values into the academic culture in which they were immersed. The adolescents experienced the women's movement as a challenge to their forming sense of identity as women; along with adopting an equal rights ideology they internalized an expectation for combining motherhood and a career. The children of the second-wave feminists, who are now young professors, take feminism for granted as a new institutional norm. Their

scholarship forges new territory in problemmatizing difference as they take on intersectionality studies as their transformational task.

Given these different developmental trajectories, the co-existence of diverse feminisms in the institution is not unexpected. Running through these career/life stories, however, is a common thread or cord composed of several threads, that forms a feminist cultural core. Each of these individuals' intellectual pursuits derived from a deeply felt personal desire for social justice. For many, the integration of multiple parts of self was critical in forming a research agenda. An affinity for interdisciplinarity, reflected in their choice of field, (e.g.. social psychology, sociocultural anthropology,) approach to subject, (e.g. combining artistic and philosophical approaches to studying writers), and choosing a dual course of study (e.g. law and sociology) is an orientation that pervades these scholars development. Most expressed their value of social change in either their work as community-builders within the institution or through the applied nature of their research (e.g. changing women's lives in the Middle East, in the science community, through legal or urban planning policy that improves the conditions for mothers and children living in poverty).

The ways in which they enact feminist culture, however, differ depending not only on their generational cohort but depending on differences that cut across generational lines. Different disciplinary cultures, institutional cultures, career paths, and race and class backgrounds are factors which shape these feminist scholars' views of and roles in institutional transformation. Stewart and Stanton (1995) recognized the fundamental power of the disciplines in training feminist scholars and shaping the structure and meaning of knowledge production. Within different disciplinary contexts,

there are different "tasks and goals" for women's studies, such as "the critique and revision of existing research, the development of underused or unused categories such as gender, and the applied demonstration of their value in disciplinary research traditions, and lastly, the critique and re(de)finition of categories, methodologies, and paradigms" (p.201) [sic].

Whereas most of the disciplines represented in this study are among the more interpretive and therefore more "deeply transformed" by feminism today, in the early seventies that was not the case. The two scholars trained in psychology, a relatively more positivistic discipline, developed a feminist consciousness within a context of graduate training that combined conventional approaches to research with a social justice focus. In assimilating these two cultures, they experienced feminism as being compatible with their existing ideas about knowledge production. Although social psychology is considered to be more amenable to feminist revision than other subfields within psychology, its positivistic roots shape how feminists in that area perceive transformation.

The two scholars from anthropology and history, were among the first to challenge the underlying assumptions and methodologies of their disciplines and their individual stories illustrated how personal transformation intersected with institutional structures in this deeper level transformative task. If the more interpretive nature of these disciplines made them more amenable to feminist transformation, the particular career trajectories of these two "nontraditional scholars" seems also to have had a role in the different feminist perspective these individuals brought to the transformation effort. Their enlarged vision for change is rooted in their experiences outside of the academy--in the labor market, within other social change movements, and in their personal lives.

For those participants who worked and became involved in social causes outside of the academy and for whom the decision to pursue an academic career was not clear-cut, a different perspective on institutional transformation was formulated. Their interest in critiquing the fundamental structures and processes of the institution, no doubt, stemmed from a wider perspective on social relations and the power structures they inhere. Also, because of their interrupted educational path, they experienced feminism in the context of other countries, in one case, and in other types of institutions (e.g. an innovative institution such as University of California, Santa Cruz and in a grassroots women's studies program at California State University, Long Beach). These experiences widened their perspective on various institutional contexts and the implications for change. It is likely that having completed their doctorates at 40 and 41 in 1979, the diverse experiences they brought to their studies in a context of proliferating feminist scholarship, empowered them to challenge the predominate institutional culture in their scholarship with a more critical perspective than some of their feminist colleagues.

Those whose career trajectories were uninterrupted by work and other interests outside of the academy, became socialized early into the prevailing normative culture of the academy. They learned how to be heard, be respected and how to negotiate within its extant structures. Despite a fervent commitment to feminist goals and scholarship, they did not perceive these values to be in conflict with academic values as they understood them. They perceived a feminist transformation as a widening of the educational community and used their status within the institution to create a space for feminist scholarship.

Finally, development of social class consciousness, and to some extent, race consciousness, was concurrently experienced with acquiring a feminist consciousness; again, this difference cut across generational lines. For those who came from working class families of origin, awareness of the structural nature of oppression was a powerful force in shaping their identity, values, vocational choices and vision for institutional change. For the one participant who was Jewish, religious oppression was the aspect of identity that motivated a desire for social justice. The Latina scholar, identified class, racial and gender oppression as being integrally related to her development as a feminist scholar. For these individuals, the transformative project encompasses the broadest emancipatory goals; their feminism was expressed as a discourse of difference.

Because this paper focuses on only one dimension of the larger study of institutional transformation, linking these developmental data to implications for institutional transformation would appear to be unfounded. However there are a number of critical insights that can be gained even from this partial analysis, that inform us about the process of feminist transformation. First, recognizing the co-existence of diverse feminisms and their sociohistoric and personal origins that even this small sample presents, heightens our awareness of the complexity of understanding an institution from a cultural perspective. Even with a subculture such as academic feminism, myriad and shifting values systems constitute a seemingly coherent community. And when a feminist transformation is conceived as a cultural shift, i.e. a marginalized culture dislodges the dominant culture, then fragmentation within the transformative culture would seem to diminish its effectiveness.

But from the earliest theoretical formulations within academic feminism there has always been a fundamental challenge to the dualistic, "either/or" modes of thinking about the world. Gloria Steinem, reaffirmed that core principle in her foreword to Rebecca Walker's edited book, to be real, rejecting the misconception that : "a depolarized, full-circle world view, one that sees *and* instead of *either/or*, *linking* where there has been *ranking*, has not always been a feminist specialty" (1995, p.xxiii). This way of thinking, together with a persistent critical (and self-reflexive) stance, has created a unique form of community with the academy, one that is captured in Gina Dent's description of "a free-forming nexus of ideas" (1995, p.71). In this version of "unity through diversity," the feminist community has indeed thrived in a constant state of tension.

The implications of this prosopography, or group biographical approach to understanding feminist transformation, then, are that the complexities that surface through a contextual and highly personal account of feminist culture portend a different way of thinking about what sustains a change effort over time. The effectiveness of the effort can be understood more in terms of its vitality, than in terms of its measurable outcomes. Because of the evolutionary nature of transformation, (i.e. the playing field changes as progress is made and so goals seem perpetually unrealized), it is more productive to see the success of the transformative effort in terms of its vitality. Vitality, conceptualized as the extent to which the community is dialogic, is a more appropriate focus of assessing and understanding institutional transformation on this scale.

The transformative value of dialogism has been the focus of much of the analyses of academic feminism (Stanton & Stewart, 1995; Hirsch & Keller, 1990) and is rooted in theorizations of the intersecting oppressions of race, age, sexual orientation, and gender

Collins, 1990). Dialogism, which refers to the reflexive pattern of thought and practice, which contrasts with binary, "either/or" thinking, is integrally related to concepts of inclusivity and constructive conflict (Hirsch & Keller, 1990). Expecting difference and conflict, and engaging in dialogues of mutual respect have recently been the cited as the imperative for postmodern institutions of higher education (Tierney, 1993; Lincoln, 1991; Bensimon, 1994). Black feminist epistemology offers a clear perspective on how, through such dialogues people can learn to "center in another experience" and "pivot the center" in order to validate distinctive standpoints without the need to compare or adopt that standpoint as their own, and without imposing the notion of a norm (Collins, 1990, p.236 & 237).

Implicit in this portrait of internal differentiation of the feminist community and the critical role of dialogism in sustaining institutional transformation is a guiding framework for inquiry. The "four quadrant model" described earlier in this paper, was used to develop a grounded theory of how academic feminism transforms the institution by making it more emancipatory. Through further exploration of the individual/exterior, group/interior, and group/exterior dimensions of organizational life for these scholars at UCLA, the role of dialogism was a central theme in the larger study. On different levels, dialogism within the individual, between individuals, between individuals and structures, and between structures was central to maintaining a cultural core that is emancipatory in its unified, but diverse nature.

References

Astin, H. & Leland, C. (1991). Women of influence, women of vision: A cross-generational study of leaders and social change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bensimon, E. M. (Fall 1994). Bilingual cash machines, multicultural campuses, and communities of differences. Innovative Higher Education, 19 (1). 23-31.

Boxer, M. J. (1998). When women ask the questions. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins.

Collins, P. H. (1990). Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment. NY: Routledge.

Dent, G. (1995). Missionary position. In Rebecca Walker's (Ed.) to be real. New York: Anchor.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. L. & Shaw, L. L. (1995). Writing ethnographic fieldnotes. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Gumport, P. J. (August, 1987). The social construction of knowledge: Individual and institutional commitments to feminist scholarship. Dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University.

Hirsch, M. & Keller, E. F. (Eds.) (1990). Conflicts in feminism. New York: Routledge.

Josselson, R. & Lieblich, A. (Eds.) (1993). The narrative study of lives. (vol.1). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S. (1991). "Advancing a critical agenda," in William G. Tierney, (Ed.). Culture and ideology in higher education: Advancing a critical agenda. NY: Praeger.

Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Morgan, G. (1997). Images of organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis. Second edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Riessman, C. K. (1993). Narrative analysis. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Smith, L. M. (1994). Biographical methods. In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) (1994). Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.,pp. 286-303.

Stacey, J. (1995). "Disloyal to the disciplines: A feminist trajectory in the borderlands" in Donna C. Stewart and Abigail J. Stewart. (Eds.) Feminisms in the Academy. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Stacey, J. (1988). "Can there be a Feminist Ethnography?" Women's Studies International Quarterly 11, no. 1:21-27.

Stewart, A. J. (1994). The women's movement and women's lives: Linking individual development and social events, in Amia Lieblich and Ruthellen Josselson's (Eds.) Exploring Identity and Gender: The Narrative Study of Lives. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stewart, A. J. & Stanton, D.C. (Eds.) (1995). Feminisms in the academy. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1994). "Grounded theory methodology: An overview," in Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage., pp. 273-285.

Tierney, W. G. (1991). (Ed.). Culture and ideology in higher education: Advancing a critical agenda. William Praeger: NY.

Tierney, W. G. (1993). Building communities of difference: Higher education in the twenty-first century. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Walker, R. (1995). To be real. New York: Anchor.

Weedon, C. (1987). Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Weick, K. E. (1995). Sensemaking in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wilber, K. (1998). The marriage of sense and soul. New York: Random House.

Wing, (1997). (Ed.) Critical race feminism. New York: New York University.